



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/633,806	08/07/2000	Sameh W. Asaad	YOR9-2000-0175	3370
21254	7590	01/07/2004		
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			EXAMINER DINH, DUC Q	
			ART UNIT 2674	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/07/2004

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/633,806

Applicant(s)

ASAAD ET AL.

Examiner

DUC Q DINH

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-14 and 19-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-14 and 19-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 6-14 and 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original disclosure, when filed does not disclose “a first portion comprising a first local bus based on a first protocol and a first interface to convert a serial signal into to said first protocol, said second portion comprising a second local bus based on said first protocol and a second interface to convert said first protocol into said serial signal, said first protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 1 and 14); or at least a portion of an extended bus bridge, said portion comprising a first local bus based on a protocol and an interface to convert a serial into said protocol, said protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 9)”. The disclosure, specifically Fig. 3, page 8 only discloses, “B0 is the primary side interface of the chip, and it interfaces to the primary PCI bus as a regular PCI-PCI bridge. All PCI addressed to B0 is serialized across a high-speed serial link using, for example, a Gigabit Ethernet as its physical layer. On the remote side of the serial cable, interface B1 converts the serial stream back to PCI traffic and relays it to the graphic card now connected to the secondary PCI (bus 1) as shown”. However, the specification as originally filed does not provide a support for the claim limitation “a first portion comprising a

Art Unit: 2674

first local bus based on a first protocol and a first interface to convert a serial signal into to said first protocol, said second portion comprising a second local bus based on said first protocol and a second interface to convert said first protocol into said serial signal, said first protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 1 and 14); or at least a portion of an extended bus bridge, said portion comprising a first local bus based on a protocol and an interface to convert a serial into said protocol, said protocol defined by a standard of a local internal bus of a computer (claim 9) ”.

The examiner examines the application based on the best understood of the claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 6-7, 9-11, 14, 19-20 and 22-23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art, (page 1 through page 4 line 7), hereinafter AAPA.

In reference to claim 1, the AAPA discloses a system for displaying information comprising: a CPU coupled to the bus bridge 103 at first portion; a graphic adaptor 104 couple to the second portion of the bus bridge; a monitor couple to the graphic adaptor; and a serial link

Art Unit: 2674

from the PC box to the monitor display. The AAPA fails to suggest that the graphic adaptor is localized to the monitor; and a serial link for coupling the first and second portions of the extended bus bridge.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to relocate the graphic adaptor from the PC box to the monitor as desired as was judicially recognized with *IN RE JAPIKEE* USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter. And it would also been obvious to separate the bus bridge in the AAPA system as desired as was judicially recognized with *IN NERWIN V. ERLICHMAN*, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO BD. OF INT. 1969), which recognizes that the separation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter and use the serial link 102 in the AAPA system to connect two portions of the bus together to transfer display data for the system.

In reference to claim 6, the AAPA discloses the cable 102 in Fig 1.

In reference to claim 7, the AAPA discloses that the extended bus bridge is a PCI bus bridge (page 1, line 9) coupled to graphic adaptor.

In reference to claims 9-11 and 22, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 1, 6-7.

In reference to claims 14, 19-20 and 23 are method claims corresponding to the apparatus of claims 1, 6-7, and 9-11; and therefore, rejected based on the same basis set forth in said claims.

5. Claims 8, 12-13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Strongin (U. S. Patent No. 6,304,935).

Art Unit: 2674

In reference to claims 8, 12-13 and 21, the AAPA fails to disclose that the at least portion of the extended bridge comprises an Accelerated Graphic Port (AGP) bus bridge coupled to the graphic adaptor. Strongin discloses a portion of a AGP bus bridge 104 coupled to the graphic processor 202 as claimed.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made provide the AGP bus bridge to couple the graphic processor for the system of the AAPA because it would alleviate data bottlenecking for the system (col. 6, lines 1-6).

6. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view Miyamoto et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,097,364), hereinafter Miyamoto.

In reference to claims 24-25 the AAPA fails to disclose that only the information that change is transferred to the display device. Miyamoto discloses a display control apparatus in which only the information that changes is transferred to the display unit (see Fig. 1, col. 5, lines 5-25).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Miyamoto for transferring only information that changes to the monitor in the AAPA's device because it would provide a system that could increase the data processing speed by only the updating the changing portion of a screen image.

Art Unit: 2674

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of Kikuchi (U. S. Patent No. 5,576,735)

In reference to claim 26, the AAPA fails to disclose the parallel connection between the graphics adaptor and the monitor. Kikuchi discloses a parallel connection between the display system and the graphic adaptor (Fig. 5-7, column 10, lines 24-65).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kikuchi, i.e.: using the parallel connection between the graphic controller and the display device, in the AAPA device for increasing the data transferring speed between the graphics adapter and the display device.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments see pages 5-10 of the Amendment, filed 10/20/03, with respect to newly added claim 26 has been considered. Claim 26 has been rejected in view of the AAPA and newly discovered prior art of Kikuchi et al. With respect to claims 1,2,6-7,9-11,14,19,20,22 and 23. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to relocate the graphic adaptor from the PC box to the monitor as desired as was judicially recognized with IN RE JAPIKEE USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), which recognizes that the relocation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter. And it would also been obvious to separate the bus bridge in the AAPA system as desired as was judicially recognized with IN NERWIN V. ERLICHMAN, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO BD. OF INT. 1969), which recognizes that the separation of well known element is normally not desired toward patentable subject matter and use the serial link 102 in the AAPA system to connect two

Art Unit: 2674

portions of the bus together to transfer display data for the system. With respect to the arguments, "in the monitor, the extended bus bridge includes a bus... plus a chip to convert the serial link signal back into the computer plus a chip to convert the serial link signal back into the computer localized bus protocol to interface with graphic adaptor 304, 404 in the monitor (page 8, lines 2-8), those limitations are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, there is no support in the specification for the newly added limitation in independent claims (page 9, lines 9-21). See the 112 First Paragraph Rejection above.

Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DUC Q DINH** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-5412**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **RICHARD A HJERPE** can be reached on **(703) 305-4709**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, Va Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

DQD
December 24, 2003


RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY SENIOR EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600